

# 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers Program

21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Reviewer Scoring Report – Cohort 10



<b>Applicant Name:</b>	<b>Euell A Wilson Center</b>
<b>Proposal Ranking:</b>	35
<b>Average Score</b>	108.5/ 125

## Proposal Strengths:

- The application had many highlights to help create a successful program, such as, extended pick up hours, close connection with school and events to help with recruitment and brand identity, "parent empowerment class", one-on-one family meetings, and a strong collaboration with the school to focus on STEM for the youth. The program has great assets with community partners, and ones who can help lift up the program in the area of STEM. This needs to be more planned and intentional to help connect the priority area to implementation.
- This is a very well developed plan that identifies specific needs and describes a program design to meet the needs. The needs assessment includes multiple data sources. A variety of partners and their specific contribution/support/services were listed.
- Overall, Euell A. Wilson Center submitted an impressive application for their STEM afterschool program in southeast Fort Wayne, Indiana. The priority area (STEM) consistently flowed through the application. They never veered from their proposed STEM OST program. Also, they maintained consistent and exception detail in their evaluation plan and program design. It was impressive to see the applicant consistently mentioned the importance of their advisory council to their program, as well as utilizing Indiana Academic and the Indiana Afterschool Standards to support their overall program. The focus on family engagement was an enormous strength to this application. It is apparent they do serve and will continue to serve and engage students, parents and the whole family unit. It was great to hear about the Euell A. Wilson Center's rich history in Fort Wayne. Tragic but powerful story that now elevates their mission today. Also, it was great to see Euell was able to serve youth in his community after all. It is clear EAWC worked effectively and deeply with their partner Irwin to develop this proposal and kept good communication throughout, which has set a strong precedence for a successful program. The STEM Program indicators were a strong element and will be a natural evaluator for their program, if they are funded.

## Proposal Weaknesses:

- The professional development portion seemed short on offerings that were diverse, they were limited, and didn't display they were offered to school-day staff. The performance measure table didn't list STEM as a main program goal. To make STEM successful, it needs to be the focus, and lead the show. As well, it had limited availability to youth in the weekly schedules.
- The professional development plan did not clearly connect to the goals/objectives. The communication did not include a detailed process for program and school staff to



continuously meet to discuss student progress or struggles.

- This applicant struggled with defining “at-risk youth” and “disadvantaged youth” throughout their narrative. These terms were consistently repeated without much clarification as to who they explicitly referring or the reason why. In recent years, it is no longer a best practice to use deficit-based language, such as at-risk youth. Now, words should be more asset-driven, human-focused, and center on the wholeness of each student. For example, "EAWC's STEM program will serve young people who are experiencing marginalization due to systemic barriers. Further, EAWC works with young people to bring about their personal power as they work to change these barriers through understanding and actualizing STEM engagement." As a reader, it felt the applicant seemed to stereotype and single out African American (AA) students. At times, they seemed to imply AA students have achievement gaps due to both their race and low-income (poverty level). However, it was revealed later in the application that 100% of EAWC staff are African American, which was surprising to hear in how they conveyed data related to AA students. Further, the applicant never fully defined who the economically disadvantaged students are nor did they include data for Hispanic, multi-racial or Asian students. For example, the applicant made the statement, “traditionally, more than 90% of students who attend programming at the EAWC are African American and come from low-income families” However, there was no mention of economic data or a clear definition to verify a need or who low-income families clearly represent. The applicant also utilized data consistently without referencing the source. Without identifying the source, the reader cannot assume it is factual or applicable. It just appears it is the applicant’s assumptions. They did a much better job later in the application, however in the sections that explicitly asked for data, they would include phrases without an origin, which made it hard to relate the given data to the geographic area served by the proposed program.

**Top Areas Where Points Were Lost:**

- Safety and Transportation
- Professional Development
- Budget
- Need for Project
- Program Qualifications